

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.: 10/647,408

Group Art Unit: 3731

Filed: August 25, 2003

Examiner: Glenn K Dawson

Applicant: Ravi Kumar

Attorney Docket: ARV-003

Title: Removable Blood Vessel Occlusion Device

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313

Sir:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

This is a timely reply to office communications mailed February 27, 2007, and February 28, 2007. No fee is believed due. If any fee is due at this time, please charge the fee to deposit account no. 07-1732.

A Statement of the Substance of the Interview begins on page 2 hereof.

Remarks are found on page 4 hereof.

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

The Examiner and two Attorneys for the Applicant held a personal interview on February 15, 2007, concerning all of the pending claims. It is respectfully brought to the Examiner's attention that one participant was omitted from the list of participants on the Examiner's Interview Summary. In addition to the listed participants, (the Examiner, Glenn K. Dawson, and Applicant's Attorney, David Gordon), Applicant's Attorney Jay Sbrollini also participated. If necessary to make this change of record, the Examiner is respectfully requested to issue a corrected Interview Summary to record the participation of Mr. Sbrollini.

One embodiment of the device was exhibited. US Patent No. 6,746,468 to Sepetka was discussed. Applicant's Attorneys argued that Sepetka is not for use in occluding an open end of a vessel, but rather an aneurysm. Applicant's Attorneys further argued that the prior art worked differently from and was not disclosed as operating in the same environment as the Applicant's invention. The Examiner contended that the Applicant was relying on intended use and functional language and that Sepetka read on the structure that was claimed and could have performed as recited in the claims.

With regard to the diameter effecting means, Applicant's Attorneys maintained that the enlarged diameter portion merely folds inwardly during traction caused by filament 204. The Examiner identified locations in the specification which seem to

indicate that the means really acted as a purse string closure to reduce the diameter of the enlarged portion.

Agreement with respect to the claims was not reached. Applicant's Attorneys indicated that a Supplemental Amendment might be filed. (A Supplemental Amendment was subsequently filed on February 20, 2007.) No formal indication of allowability was given.

REMARKS

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the Supplemental Amendment filed on February 20, 2007, as supplemented by the foregoing Interview Summary, is now fully responsive. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter and consider such Supplemental Amendment. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay P. Sbrollini
Reg. No. 36,266
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.
60 Long Ridge Road
Suite 407
Stamford, CT 06902
(203) 323-1800

March 14, 2007